

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120 remain pending in the application.

35 USC 112 Second Paragraph Rejection of Claims 110, 114 and 118

The Office Action rejected claims 110, 114 and 118 as allegedly being indefinite under 35 USC 112. In particular, the Office Action alleges that "it is uncertain whether the header in the claim refers to a header of a request [i.e., does it indicate the device related information such as Web browser type, operating system etc. will be included in the header of the client's request]." (See Office Action, page 2).

Claims 110, 114 and 118 recite a client device related information is provided in a header. Thus, the claim broadly recites a header, which can include a header of a request, but can be included a header of any data packet. Thus, the claim clearly and broadly recites a client device related information is provided in a header, the header type not being limited by claims 110, 114 and 118.

Moreover, the Examiner questions if the device related information such as Web browser type, operating system etc. will be included in the header of the client's request. A Web browser type, operating system, etc. are **NOT** recited as being included in a header of a client's request. Although such elements could conceivably be included in a header of a client's request, such limitations are **NOT** recited by claims 110, 114 and 118. Thus, whether a Web browser type, operating system, etc. are included in a header of a client's request is a moot point.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 110, 114 and 118 are in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120 over Greer in view of AAPA

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 14, 33-38, 40, 41, 45, 58-65, 67, 68, 72, 106-111, 113-115 and 117-119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,247,048 to Greer et al. ("Greer"), with claims 8, 11-13, 15, 39, 42-44, 46, 66, 69-71, 73, 112, 116 and 120 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Greer in view of Official Notice. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-108 recite **filtering** content in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device the content is viewable on.

Greer appears to disclose a system and method of transcoding character sets between Internet hosts and thin client devices over data networks (See Abstract). The conversion includes conversion from English using US-ASCII character set to Japanese using Shift-JIS character set (See Greer, col. 1, lines 41-46). A proxy server handles the task of character transcoding so as to alleviate mobile computing devices from having to perform character set transcoding (See Greer col. 6, lines 2-6).

Thus, Greer discloses a proxy server performing transcoding to convert characters from one language to another. Greer fails to disclose or suggest the proxy server performs any type of **filtering** of content, much less **filtering** of content in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device the content is viewable on, as recited by claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-108.

The Examiner relies on Official Notice to disclose defining a mobile device by a manufacturer and model, and providing a secure socket layer connection (See Office Action, pages 7 and 8).

Even with taking Official Notice, Greer in view of Official Notice fails to disclose, teach or suggest **filtering** content in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device the content is viewable on, as recited by claims 1-15, 33-46 and 58-73.

A benefit of **filtering** content in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device the content is viewable on is, e.g., making content viewable on a mobile device that lacks an ability to display content in its original form with reduced bandwidth requirements. Some mobile devices have limited display capabilities, such as color limitations, lack of graphical capability, etc. Transmitting content that is developed for a device that has full graphical capability to a device that has limited display capabilities is fruitful and a waste of resources. Thus, by filtering content in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device the content is viewable on eliminates unusable content from being transferred to the mobile device. Moreover, preventing unusable content from being transferred to a mobile device eliminates large amounts of data from being transferred over a wireless network, reducing network bandwidth requirements. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features having such benefits.

Claims 109-120 recite conversion of content based on a client device related information, the client device related information comprising at least one of a content viewer and an operating system.

As discussed above, Greer discloses transcoding character sets between Internet hosts and thin client devices over data networks. The client device initiates a request to establish a communication session with a proxy server (See Greer, col. 6, lines 39-44). The request comprises necessary information about the client device, such as device information, an assigned phone number or character set information that the client device uses (See Greer, col. 6, lines 44-48).

Thus, Greer discloses sending device information, an assigned phone number or character set information that the client device uses **NOT** client device related information comprising at least one of a content viewer and an operating system, as recited by claims 109-120.

As discussed above, Official Notice is relied on to disclose defining a mobile device by a manufacturer and model, and providing a secure socket layer connection. Thus, even with taking Official Notice Greer in view of Official

Notice fails to disclose, teach or suggest conversion of content based on a client device related information, the client device related information comprising at least one of a content viewer and an operating system, as recited by claims 109-120.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-15, 33-46 and 58-73 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be canceled.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307
WHB/df